

ry experience, patients who by a combination of antipsychotic about 15% of those of these drugs in skilled nursing or psychiatric hospitals. probably the experience of the other psychiatrists who, like us, continue to use combined therapy the guidelines to the con-

pe the cited authorities in the will either explain why these ons are not frequent and/or do present rational use or change advice in their future editions here is seldom indication to be use of antipsychotics with the side effect profile, but there sequent indications to combine with different profiles," and be the indications. Only then government reviewers change current "indicator" of inappropriate drug prescribing and will clin- be relieved of their current n of being faulted by reviewers rational prescribing practice.

LEVIN Glickman, MD  
Bronx, NY

Wall CP, Glass EM. Concomitant antipsychotic. JAMA 1983;250:1382.  
Lieber R, Jackson AH. Approaches to schizophrenia. In: (ed) Manual of Psychiatric Therapeutic Psychopharmacology and Psychiatry. Boston: Brown & Co, 1975, p 89.  
Lieber R. J. Chronotherapy in Psychiatry. Mass: Harvard University Press, 1977, p 27.  
Lieber R. P. Haloperidol. In: Psychotropic Drugs: A Practical Approach. New York: Oxford Press, 1982, p 175-200.  
Lieber R, Glickman R. Most stroke in phenothiazine patients. A report of three fatalities. Am J Med 1976;61:129-132.  
Lieber R, Rastogi A. Hypertension from drug abuse. JAMA 1978;239:1280.

ply.—Dr Glickman's letter ex- on the necessarily brief com- we made in our initial answer to question that "various antipsychotic drugs do not differ in specific or particular target symptoms, ough they do differ in side effect les." Systematic studies have not orted the belief that particular psychotic drugs are more effica- for patients with particular ptoms, eg, agitation. However, agree with Dr Glickman that the of two antipsychotic drugs with rent adverse effect profiles may etimes be helpful in achieving a er balance between total thera- ic effect and adverse effects. ither this procedure is regularly e beneficial than either dose istment with a single antipsychot- rug or the addition of an antipar- onian drug is an interesting ical question that can be settled y a carefully controlled re- ch trial. We are not aware that a study has been done.

Given the present state of knowl- edge about this issue, we believe that the concomitant use of two different antipsychotic drugs should be a mat- ter for the clinical judgment of the prescribing physician. Most impor- tant are the identification of indica- tions for the use of antipsychotic drugs, monitoring for adverse effects, and careful assessment of the need to continue treatment with these drugs for more than a few months.

ROBERT M. GLICKMAN, MD  
CHAS. P. FARMER, MD  
University of Chicago  
Regular School of Medicine

1. Davis JM. Antipsychotic drugs. In: Kaplan VL, Freedman AM, Sadock BJ (eds) Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry, ed 3. Baltimore, Williams & Wilkins Co, 1980, pp 2261-2282.  
2. Jurek DV, Wyatt RJ. Understanding and Treating Schizophrenia. New York: Guilford Press, 1982, pp 333-350.

### Costs and Benefits of Cesarean Sections

To the Editor.—Dr Sachs et al<sup>1</sup> made a nice contribution with their article on cesarean section. The cost-morbid- ity angle of studies on the delivery of low-birth weight and breech infants needs to encompass those infants who do not die but have permanent neuro- logical damage and live a very long time at a tremendous expense.

G. C. TAYLOR, MD  
Dallas

1. Sachs BP, McCarthy M, Rubin G, et al. Cesarean section. Risk and benefits for mother and fetus. JAMA 1983;250:2157-2159.

In Reply.—Dr Nabors' kind words are appreciated. We were unable to assess either the cost of long-term care for infants that do not die or the decreased cost for those infants less traumatized because of a cesarean delivery. We therefore emphasized that our study was not meant to be a cost-benefit analysis but an opening shot in a discussion that needs to take place.

BRANDON P. SACHS, MD, BS, (SMC)  
Harvard Medical School  
Beth Israel Hospital  
Boston

### Passive Smoking and Uptake of Carbon Monoxide in Flight Attendants

To the Editor.—There is concern about the health effects of passive smoking.<sup>1</sup> Because of concern among flight attendants about passive exposure to cigarette smoke during work on commercial aircraft, a preliminary investigation was conducted to search for an increase in expired air (end tidal) carbon monoxide in flight attendants after work. Expired air (end tidal) carbon monoxide was de-

ten because carbon monoxide concen- tration is known to vary linearly with the rate of cigarette burning in an environment.<sup>2</sup>

Volunteers gave their informed consent after the nature of the proce- dures had been explained to them. Nonsmoking volunteer flight attend- ants filled out health history ques- tionnaires before flight and recorded their observations during flight. Ex- pired air (end tidal) carbon monoxide was measured before and after each flight for each volunteer. All flights were "turnaround" flights from Los Angeles to Honolulu and back. These flights were of about five hours' dura- tion in each direction, with an hour on the ground in Honolulu.

The volunteers were 16 women between 35 and 48 years of age. Four of them worked in nonsmoking sec- tions only during the flights of inter- est. There was no increase in the concentration of carbon monoxide in the expired air (end tidal) of these flight attendants during the flights in this study. In fact, their expired air carbon monoxide levels decreased by an insignificant amount. When the four attendants who worked in the nonsmoking areas were excluded from the analysis, the results were not altered substantially. These re- sults are consistent with results of a similar study reported in 1983<sup>3</sup> and an earlier study involving a larger num- ber of subjects.<sup>4</sup> These results indi- cate that the concentration of smoke to which flight attendants are pas- sively exposed is too low to alter significantly their expired air carbon monoxide levels. Other possible health effects of such exposure are not addressed.

CHARLES S. DUBAN,  
MAYNARD P. GINSBERG, MD  
University of California, Irvine  
Orange Occupational Health Clinic

1. White JR, French MF. Small airway dysfunction in non-smokers chronically exposed to tobacco smoke. N Engl J Med 1980;302:780-783.  
2. Huestis LS. Cigarette smoke in closed spaces. Environ Health Perspect 1972;2:117.  
3. Fildes D, Benowitz NL, Barker CE. Passive absorption of nicotine in airline flight attendants. N Engl J Med 1983;308:1105.  
4. Report on Health Aspects of Smoking in Transport Aircraft. Dept of Health and Human Services, December 1981.

### Foreign Body in a Meckel's Diverticulum

To the Editor.—A 19-month-old girl infant was seen because of abdominal pain and discomfort. Her mother stated that approximately six weeks ago, she had swallowed a penny. Roentgenograms revealed the coin in the right lower quadrant. The patient continued to have intermittent bouts of abdominal pain and vomiting. Seri-

al roentgenograms showed no progress. Exploration was done; the coin was found in a diverticulum. The diverticulum, with the coin, was excised. Recovery was unremarkable for a wound abscess with drainage.

### Access to Medical

To the Editor.—In his "A New Physician St. Ginzberg" seems to St. Ginzberg, NY, will never "including black p" remark conveys the in- and when Harlem g this one would be a bi- token, the next phys- into a reservation is native American. Th- ing is analogous to famous "separate bu- once applied to our e

Having asked "W" the poor and minor said that "access to t- system is not to b- access to private pr- therefore encourage- minorities to go to rooms and/or seek- nurse practitioners." no longer "separate b- but a more pragma- "some care is better all." Soon we wou- doors to the health- side door for the po- ties!

In either case, Dr (ommanding a drastic principles of equalit- Whatever new physic- cy is set up, it shou- rationing services an- deviate from the gold- access to quality care

1. Ginzberg E. A new physi- needed. JAMA 1983;250:2622-2623.

In Reply.—I share wi- the letter a deep dis- the fact that my co- variance with the- access to quality ca- referring to realities- anybody else's prefer- ingly, despite the la- physicians entering t- tem, I see little likeli- tioners setting up pri-

JAMA, May 25, 1984—Vol 251, No. 20